

Remarks

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's entry of Amendment A filed on February 19, 2003.

In the present Office Action, claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kume et al (U.S. 5,111,107). Claims 1 and 3 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ragland, Jr. (U.S. 5,932,957). Claim 1 as amended is patentably distinct from both Ragland, Jr. and Kume et al since neither reference teaches nor suggests a tension mask being supported between a pair of support blade members wherein the support blade members are each attached to the frame at an attachment point along opposing sides wherein the mask support frame has a first coefficient of thermal expansion being different from a second coefficient of thermal expansion for the detensioning member. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is therefore respectfully requested

Claims 4-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kume et al in view of Ragland, Jr. and Fendley et al (U.S. 4,866,334). The Examiner contends that Kume discloses all of the claim limitation of Claim 4 but fails to clearly point out that the detensioning member is fixed along the inner surface of the long sides and that the frame is a continuous generally planar frame. The Examiner further contends that regarding claims 4-11 while Ragland, Jr. discloses all of the claim limitation, it also fails to teach that the frame is continuous and generally planar. The Examiner then proceeds to rely upon Fendley et al for a disclosure of the frame being a continuously generally planar frame in order to support the mask and to have a substantially flat face plate. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not made a prima facie case of obviousness in rejecting these claims.

Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produced the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination. The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by

the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. None of the three references cited suggest combining the features of a rectangular support frame having each of the sides connected to form a continuously generally planar frame with detensioning members fixed along the peripheral surfaces of the sides and having a different coefficient of thermal expansion from that of the frame.

Both Kume et al and Ragland, Jr. teach detensioning mechanisms which draw resilient opposing portions of the frame towards each other in order to detension the mask. Combining Fendley et al with those references would destroy their intended purpose since Fendley et al teaches a support frame having a reinforcing material in order to prevent undesired inward flexure of the shadow mask support structure. As Fendley et al teach in paragraph 5, line 35, a mechanically rigid structure is mandatory. Such a mechanically rigid structure, if applied to the teachings of Ragland, Jr. and Kume et al would destroy their intended purpose of allowing flexure in the frame in order to detension the mask.

Since the Examiner has not made a prima facie case of obviousness in rejecting these claims, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan Weir Bucher, Applicant



Salvatore Anastasi
Registration No. 39,090
Attorney for Applicant
Phone: (610) 722-3899
Facsimile: (610) 889-3696